



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/812,909	03/31/2004	Alan Stillman	5545-1001-1	5707
466	7590	07/28/2005		
YOUNG & THOMPSON 745 SOUTH 23RD STREET 2ND FLOOR ARLINGTON, VA 22202			EXAMINER CHRISTMAN, KATHLEEN M	
			ART UNIT 3713	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/812,909

Applicant(s)

STILLMAN, ALAN

Examiner

Kathleen M. Christman

Art Unit

3713

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 June 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 33 and 34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 33, and 34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 03/31/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 3713

DETAILED ACTION

In response to the election filed 06/06/2005; claims 16-32 and 35-39 have been cancelled.

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group I, claims 1-15, 33 and 34 in the reply filed on 06/06/2005 is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. A mere arrangement of printed matter, though seemingly a "manufacture," is rejected as not being within the statutory classes. See *in re Miller*, 418 F.2d 1392, 164 USPQ 46 (CCPA 1969); *EX part Gwin*, 112 USPQ 439 (Bd. App. 1955); and *In re Jones*, 373 F.2d 1007, 153 USPQ 77 (CCPA 1967). In the present application, the claimed printed matter set forth a mere arrangement of printed matter that is not functionally related to the substrate and, therefore, does not distinguish the invention from prior art in terms of patentability. Although printed matter must be considered, in this situation, it is not entitled patentable weight. The printed matter claimed herein conveys no meaningful information in regard to the substrate, which they are arranged on and do not require any size relationship of the substrate, and do not require any particular substrate to effectively convey the information. Accordingly, there being no functional relationship of the printed material to the substrate, as noted above, there is no reason to give patentable weight to the content of the printed matter which, by itself, is no-statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 2, and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Meirovitz (Canadian Patent 1 181 313, hereinafter the '313 patent). The '313 patent teaches an apparatus as an aid in communicating including: a static medium (the folder) having a plurality of icons thereon so that a user can select at least one of said plural icons to communicate an idea (page 3: 8-10), as in **claim 1**. The icons are arranged in a hierarchical manner (**claim 2**) as is shown in at least page 2: 20-24. The icons are arranged in such a manner that the functionality and cognition of the icons is directly linked to the arrangement (**claim 4**) as is shown by the arrangement of the icons to allow for the easy presentation of a question, see Figure 3 and page 3: 11-18.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3713

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. Claims 3, 5-15, 33 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meirovitz (Canadian Patent 1 181 313, hereinafter the '313 patent). The '313 patent teaches a plurality of adjacent panels which are foldable into a pocket-sized device (see page 2, lines 6-8), as is the general structure of **claims 5-15**. Additional panels for detailing other concepts is shown in page 2, lines 8-11, and as the additional lexicons on page 2 lines 11-26, as in **claims 8-15, 33 and 34**.

The '313 patent discloses the claimed invention except for the specific arrangement and /or content of indicia (printed matter) set-forth in the claim(s). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to place icons of varying natures on the substrate, since it would only depend on the intended use of the assembly and the desired information to be displayed. Further, it has been held that when the claimed printed matter is not functionally related to the substrate it will not distinguish the invention from the prior art in terms of patentability. In re Gulack, 217 USPZ 401, (CAFC 1983). The fact that the content of the printed matter placed on the substrate may render the device more convenient by providing an individual with a specific type of pictogram does not alter the functional relationship. Mere support by the substrate for the printed matter is not the kind of functional relationship necessary for patentability. Thus, there is no novel and unobvious functional relationship between the printed matter e.g. the pictograms and the substrate e.g. the static medium or panels which is required for patentability.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 3713

- a. EP 0068935-european patent, which is the priority document to the above Canadian patent
- b. Kerns et al (US 2003/0157465 A1)-teaches a method for communicating with a physically disabled person using a plurality of sheets with pictograms printed thereon

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kathleen M. Christman whose telephone number is (571) 272-4435. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Xuan Thai can be reached on (571) 272-7147. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Kathleen M Christman
Examiner
Art Unit 3713

July 18, 2005